DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 076 SP 003 155

American Historical Association Proposal in History Education.
American Historical Association, Washington, D.C.
Spons Agency - Indiana Univ., Bloomington.
Pub Date 68
Note - 14p.
EDRS Price MF -$0.25 HC -$0.80
Descriptors - Curriculum Development, *Educational Improvement, *History Instruction, *Institutes (Training Programs), Teacher Education

A 6-week institute has been designed to provide participants with the knowledge and skills necessary to strengthen history education and to transmit their knowledge to beginning and experienced teachers. Under the planning and direction of an advisory committee (composed of members of the American Historical Association), six interdisciplinary teams, each composed of a professional historian, a social studies educator, and a history teacher, will participate in activities designed to enable them to understand and create objectives in history, plan for innovative use of film and other media, analyze curricular materials available in history education from the viewpoints of content and method, use new teaching strategies and pose central questions for history education, and formulate definitions of history education in the context of a scholarly concern. Throughout the program, participants will devise training programs to be used as bases for individual and team efforts in improving history courses and teacher training programs in their schools, state and local education agencies, and higher education institutions after the institute. In addition, publicity has been arranged for these training programs by the American Historical Association, and efforts are being made to make them self-supporting. (SP)

ED033076

American Historical Association Proposal in History Education

INTRODUCTION: The Need

History is not the most popular subject taught in the schools. This statement could be documented at great length with little effort. Students know it and cannot do anything about it. Many teachers know it and don't know what to do about it. A small number of historians are learning it and are trying to do something about it.

Despite history's unpopularity in the schools, man is a historical creature. He makes use of history in countless ways without even being aware that he is doing it, and in times of domestic crises and foreign uncertainties, he makes even greater use of history. The black militants today are but one dramatic example of how men turn to history to understand the present and justify their demands on society. Unfortunately, man more often than not deals casually with history, is constrained by it and turns it into myths, which is not what today's society needs.

On both of these grounds, then -- the unpopularity of history education and the historical nature of man -- there is a need for an accurate, relevant history in the schools. Not simply accurate and relevant content, however, which in any case will soon be either inaccurate or out of date, but a history designed to develop in young people an ability to correct inaccuracies and restore relevance, based on respect for ways in which history shapes their own individual life experiences.

To accomplish this goal, we need a quiet revolution in the historical profession. We need historians who are willing to listen to, learn from and work with students, teachers and educationists. We need historians who are willing to make modest investments of their time in learning how people learn. We need historians who can do these things and then apply their historical knowledge and creativity to help teachers and the schools provide more effective learning experiences for students in history. And we need school teachers who know that historians can do

ED033155

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM TH
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINI
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATIO
POSITION OR POLICY.

this and how to cooperate best with them on it.

The American Historical Association, with Indiana University, can help to bring about such a revolution, and now is a particularly propitious time to begin. Title XI of the NDEA and the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program have made more historians aware of the dimensions of the problem than ever before. Curriculum development projects supported by the Office of Education have involved a small number of historians with the problems of history education, and their work is just beginning to bear fruit. Since 1956 the American Historical Association has had an active Committee on History in the Schools, and, with very modest amounts of money, has supported the publication of pamphlets and conferences for teachers of history. In 1966 and 1967 the AHA in cooperation with the Organization of American Historians and the National Council for the Social Studies attempted, unfortunately unsuccessfully, to gain financial support for an independent organization to be devoted entirely to furthering efforts to improve the quality of history education. In default of this broader attack on the problem, the AHA is making a modest beginning on better uses of film material for undergraduate and school history instruction.

Indiana University is appropriately the sponsoring agency for the present proposal. It not only has a large and distinguished History Department that has excellent relations with its School of Education but the Department, both individually and as a group, has shown a deep interest in the problems of history education and has an exemplary record of trying to do something about it. Moreover, the Indiana University Social Studies Development Center, that will serve as the institutional host for the History Education project, was established as a university-wide Center specifically for the purpose of providing assistance for efforts of this kind. The association of the Department of History and the Social Studies Development Center with the program augurs well for its success, both by virtue of the prestige they

give the enterprise and because of the support they can give to the various phases of the program.

There is, therefore, a background of involvement in the problems of teaching history and a pool of talent in the profession that is concerned and that can be brought to bear on these problems. It is time, now, to build upon the work of the past several years and coordinate the efforts of many people and many places, if the current interest is not to die, leaving little impact.

The opportunity is to bring historical scholarship into a new relationship to current improvements of education in the schools. For a generation now, history has been finding its footing as an "open" discipline, increasingly ready to profit from related methods of inquiry like those of literary criticism on the one hand and the various social sciences on the other, and yet confident of its own integrity. It pays increasing attention to the dimension of historian's abilities as at least equally important with that of knowing the established facts. History in the schools, at the same time, has been accepting a position of flexible colleagueship with other disciplines within the pragmatically necessary but theoretically uncertain field of Social Studies. Above all, the Office of Education's programs have now led to a new understanding that improvement of curricula may be best achieved, not by authoritative course outlines or by self-sufficient experts on history education, but by periods of shoulder-to-shoulder cooperation between scholars and classroom teachers, in which each learns from the other as they together try out innovations.

In these new terms, history education can and therefore should move toward recognition as a scholarly activity in the profession. The Association's program will focus on how better to help youngsters learn history, in the sense of learning how themselves to correct inaccuracies and restore relevance. Programs to train for competence in history education will then appropriately become a viable field of study at the doctoral level. Historians concerned with what goes on in the schools will then not encounter such a crippling separation, as now, between the

stimulating experiences of many of them in summer institutes, for example, and the world of university teaching and scholarship which is their base. The American Historical Association is the logical agency to bring about the needed initiatives, and so finally to encourage graduate schools to incorporate this new field of study in appropriate ways in their training programs.

OBJECTIVES:

The Program has three broad objectives:

1. To work toward and finally produce a high-level AHA report to the profession clarifying the current problems and possibilities of history education.
2. To bring into being a network of five to twelve regional committees on history education in the schools, under the sponsorship of various appropriate historian organizations.
3. To make use of the leadership thus provided to effect permanent and self-sustaining changes in the historical profession.

For the first and second of these objectives, the Association proposes a six-week program of study and training in which participants will learn about, analyze, and evaluate the importance for history education of, the following:

the role of objectives in the teaching/learning process

the many new curriculum materials

the potential in the use of "media" (visual and aural)

the range of teaching strategies

the social structure of the schools

The Association seeks to achieve permanent and self-sustaining changes in the profession (a) by having a highly qualified Advisory Committee plan the summer training program and subsequent activities for maximum value to the report it will finally produce, (b) by drawing together the experience of the many first-class

historians who have worked in recent years on teacher improvement programs, (c) by drawing into the new committee structure the committees on teaching (actual and potential) of existing historian organizations around the country, and (d) by providing encouragement and initial financial support to the new regional committees to experiment with effective help to those institutions and educational agencies that wish to improve the quality of their history education.

THE PROGRAM:

Outline: The program described below has three components and is designed to operate over an 18-month period:

1. It has a planning phase, from January to June 1969, during which the ad hoc Advisory Committee for the Program will meet several times.
2. It has two pilot phases, the first of which is a six-weeks' training program to be conducted in the summer of 1969.
3. The second pilot phase is a series of training activities performed during academic year 1969-70 by the participants of the training program.

Phase 1. Planning. In January 1969, the Association will convene an Advisory Committee on the History Education Program, created especially for this program. It will consist initially of one member of the following standing committees of the Association:

the Council

the Committee on Ph.D. Programs in History

the Committee on History in the Schools

the Committee on College and University Teaching

In addition, there will be two members of the Committee selected at large from the Association's membership (one of whom will be the Chairman of the Department of History at Indiana University) and two from outside the college and university

history world whose experience in other fields of education will provide needed perspective.

The Association has two purposes in mind in proposing this Advisory Committee: the first is to involve some of those in a position of influence in the Association and the profession in exploring some of the dimensions of history education. Obviously it is the Association's hope that in the process, the individual members will deepen their interest in the new possibilities, as a field of scholarly interest, and will use their influence to encourage others to become similarly interested.

The Advisory Committee will meet twice between January and June 1969 specifically to help plan the details of the summer training program. It will also convene a special group to focus upon (1) the problem of black history in the schools, and in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. These groups -- and others -- will include specialists within and without the field of history who have particular knowledge of specific problems and can help the Advisory Committee plan more effectively how both the summer training program and the subsequent activities of the participants can deal with them. Other topics for these special Advisory Committee planning groups may include:

(2) American history -- 5, 8, 11, 13 or 14?

(3) History and the Social Sciences

(4) The historical profession and the change of generations

(5) The nature of history and the nature of learning

(6) Evaluation of innovations and dissemination of new findings

The second purpose is to obtain the advice of these individuals on crucial aspects of the program and to involve them in the evaluation of its activities. Without the support of some such high-level advisory committee as this, there is little hope that the project can have a deep or permanent impact on the profession; with such support and advice, the proposed program has a chance to effect a lasting

revolution in the profession.

The Advisory Committee will convene again toward the close of the institute to participate in and evaluate the success of the six-week training program. At that time, its special task will be to help the staff and the participants plan with the Association the details of appropriate activities for academic year 1969-70. Members of the Advisory Committee will also be asked to visit the training programs conducted during the year, so that the Committee, when it next convenes, can discuss the individual findings and incorporate them in its final report. As Committee members observe the operational phase of the program, it will continue to advise and evaluate; but increasingly its attention will be focused on problems of long-range implementation: What changes does the program and its success (or lack of it) suggest for the continuing activities of the Association? How can the Association best help graduate schools recognize the possibilities of history education as a valid offering for the Ph.D. in history? How can the Association encourage graduate schools to build upon the training programs sponsored by the Association, in shaping their history education instruction for their Ph.D. students? Thus, the Advisory Committee will play a crucial role throughout the entire program.

Phase 2. The six week training program (summer 1969). The training program will bring together six teams of three individuals, each team to be composed of one professional historian in a department of history, one social studies education person in a department of education, and one teacher or local supervisor of history. These teams shall be selected from all over the country, and each team must have assurances from its own institutions or agencies that its members will be given the support necessary to revise the history and history education programs of these institutions and agencies significantly when they return. In particular, there must be assurances that the schools and the universities of each team will be enabled to enter into genuinely cooperative relationships for assisting the training of teachers.

The training program will be designed to provide the participants with the knowledge and skills necessary to strengthen their own programs as well as to help others to do so.

For the first week of the program, Professor Edwin Fenton of Carnegie-Mellon University and Professor Charles Sellers of the University of California at Berkeley will be asked to be the principal instructors. They will describe the state of history education in America today, the new curriculum and teacher training efforts now being made, and the philosophical, psychological, and pedagogical theories that the new efforts are based on. They will focus on the challenge to history education of the heavy emphasis on the role of objectives in recent efforts to improve instruction. Participants will have practice in stating, analyzing, and evaluating objectives for more sensitive and effective historical thinking. They will analyze the value of knowing objectives in choosing teaching strategies and drawing up appropriate evaluation instruments.

From this week, participants will gain a more solid grasp of what might be in the history education, and they will begin to be able to state objectives more clearly and precisely for themselves in their own teaching situations. Through discovering how focusing on objectives can improve their own teacher training programs, they will be enabled to show practical comprehension of the usefulness of teaching objectives as a means of training other teachers more effectively.

During the second week, Paul Ward, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association, and Mel Levison, Professor of History and Education at Brooklyn College, will be asked to be the principal instructors. While they will both emphasize the use of film in the history classroom, Levison in particular will deal with the full range of visual and aural media available to the teacher and the teacher trainer. The participants will have opportunities to analyze the possibilities opened up by the AHA's Feature Film program combining film and written

materials in units for undergraduate homework assignments. Participants will evaluate the use of media in relationship to both affective and cognitive objectives, will discuss the different teaching strategies this medium lends itself to, and will consider the role film and other media best can play in individualizing instruction and in dealing with large numbers of students.

As a result of the work of this second week, participants should be able to plan for the innovative use of film and other media in their own history courses and in their teacher training programs. They will be asked to plan a series of brief training activities designed to develop in others the skills they have acquired during this second week.

Irving Morrissett, Professor of Economics at the University of Colorado and Director of the Social Sciences Education Consortium, and Howard Mehlinger, Assistant Professor of History at Indiana University, will be asked to be the principal instructors during the third week. Morrissett has developed a curriculum analysis instrument that has proven its usefulness as a tool for analyses and evaluation, and Mehlinger has had experience in curriculum building and teacher training for a wide variety of curriculum efforts. Individuals trained in the use of Morrissett's curriculum analysis model are able to read and compare many curriculum materials from a consistent and relevant point of view. During this week, Morrissett and Mehlinger will teach the participants how to use this instrument with attention to the needs and limitations of effective history learning. Participants will begin to put it to use by reading and analyzing as many materials in history education as possible.

Participants will emerge from this week with a knowledge of curriculum materials available in history education, with a capacity to analyze those materials from angles of both content and method, and with the ability to help construct brief training activities in the area of curriculum analysis. The programs the participants

will consequently be able to conduct should be of great value to school districts in the process of revising history curricula.

During the fourth week, Richard H. Brown, director of the Committee on the Study of History, and Edmund S. Morgan, Sterling Professor of History at Yale University, will be asked to be the principal instructors. They will conduct an adapted version of Brown's one-week workshop in discovery learning -- a workshop that has demonstrated its effectiveness both with teachers and trainers of teachers. The key ingredient in the workshop is the demonstration class which Brown or one of his staff members teaches, using recently constructed materials illustrating new teaching strategies. Throughout the program, Brown confronts his participants with the questions: "What is History? How does the historian work? How do students learn? What should be the connection between how the historian works and how students learn?"

Much of the program of the institute will be pulled together during this fourth week through the demonstration classes and the discussions that they will spark. Participants will have opportunities to see in action the relationship between objectives, materials, teaching strategies, and evaluation. They will have further opportunities to test the validity of the curriculum analysis instrument. The fourth week should provide realistic reinforcement of the institute program. From this experience, participants will begin to be able to draw up plans for short-term training programs designed to illustrate new materials and teaching strategies and focusing upon the central questions posed throughout the institute but particularly in the fourth week.

The fifth and sixth weeks of the institute are for the present left open. The visit of the Advisory Committee will fall in this period, and one major effort will be to formulate a preliminary definition of history education as a subject of scholarly concern. During part of the two weeks the participants will be required to

draw up plans for more effective history-course units in their own institutions and to design more effectively and genuinely cooperative training programs for beginning and experienced teachers. These plans are to be for implementation during the year following their attendance at the institute. Participants will thus be working together to plan for the training activities they will conduct, under the auspices of the Association and other historical societies, for other educational agencies during 1969-70.

During the six weeks, the program will contain other important activities, including:

1. some form of group dynamics or sensitivity training, or work with a psychiatrist who has specialized on studying the historian's forms of involvement and sensitivity;

2. visitation to several kinds of schools, including:

   a. "regular" classes
   b. ghetto schools
   c. schools utilizing flexible scheduling, team teaching, and individually prescribed instruction

3. presentations from individuals knowledgeable about model programs of pre- and in-service teacher training, with particular reference to those adaptable to the regular offerings of schools and universities.

The Advisory Committee's planning (January to June 1969) will play a major role in determining the nature of the last two weeks, as well as the content of the first four and many of the supplementary activities of the entire institute. Its concern will be to maximize the value of the six weeks for its own report and for phase 3.

Phase 3. Participant activities during 1969-70. When the participants return to their home institutions, they will engage in two kinds of activities: First, individually and as teams, they will work toward improving their own history courses and their history teacher training programs. Second, they will offer during the year a number of training activities for state and local educational agencies and

for institutions of higher education in their area.

The Association will advertise throughout the country the availability of these training activities, which may vary from one-day workshops on objectives to three-day workshops on curriculum analysis to one-week workshops on discovery learning. Some of the activities will be designed for local or state educational agency personnel, some for higher education, some for both. Some will focus upon learning theory, some on curriculum developments, some on pre-service and in-service training problems and possibilities. The Association's publicity will specify clearly the purpose of the training activities and will entertain applications, not from individuals, but from local and state educational agencies and from institutions of higher education. In every possible instance, the training program will take place at the agency or institution applying for the program. In some instances, teams may wish to plan programs for groups of educational agencies or institutions and will want to hold the program at one of the places.

In order to conduct the training programs indicated above, selected participants of the institute need to be relieved of from one-quarter to one-half of their teaching loads. The Association will need to allocate training activities to them individually or in teams as seems appropriate from their interests and capacities developed in the summer program of 1969. Moreover, selected participants must be asked to bring into being regional committees on history education, under whatever auspices promise to be most effective -- an indicated example is the Southern Historical Association.

Throughout the planning phase of the program of spring 1969, the Association will therefore take all possible steps to determine the extent to which the future training activities of phase 3 can be self-supporting financially. In other words, the Association will investigate what fees it will be appropriate and possible to charge agencies and institutions for the training activities, and what contributions

may be expected from local foundations the first time around. This is most important, for if the activities prove of sufficient quality and usefulness, participating agencies and institutions should be willing to pay for most services and secure grants to cover the rest. The Association looks forward realistically to the day when such services will be a regular part of the profession's work without any need for outside financial support whatever. But because it cannot be determined at the time of writing this proposal how far and how soon this phase of the program can be made self-supporting, the attached budget proposes to pay the costs of releasing a fraction of the participants from their normal teaching duties, and of meeting their travel costs.

The continuance of this project, as a centrally-directed operational activity, in summer 1970 and academic year 1970-71 will be planned in fall 1969 if evaluations by then -- of success and further need -- are clearly favorable. If conducted, it will be modeled on the activities of 1969-70, but the number of participants projected will be larger (the figure will be based on the number of history education specialists needed to meet the anticipated demands for their training activities during 1970-71) and changes will be made in the programs on the basis of experience. An enlarged staff will be recruitable from the participants in the first year. Whether such Association-sponsored activities of 1970-71 can be self-supporting may or may not be the major consideration in deciding on continuance.

Termination. The Advisory Committee will set itself the goal of producing its report early in the spring of 1970, in time to influence final plans of interested universities and schools for the year 1970-71. From January 1969 into 1970, its efforts, the Association's support, and the activities of the program's staff and participants will be such as to arouse the interest of forward-looking universities and school systems. The Committee's report may conceivably be devoted to a series of practical maxims indicating the terms and emphases most appropriate for successful

cooperative efforts of university and school historians today. But it will in some fashion make clear what it sees as our opportunity to teach young people how to deal with history responsibly and fruitfully, for their own lives and the good of society. The report can accordingly be expected to be strong encouragement to graduate schools to incorporate better history education elements into their offerings.

Thus, at the termination of the program, whether in summer 1970 or summer 1971, the Association and its colleague historical societies will be sponsoring a wide variety of relevant training activities in history education on an increasingly self-supporting basis, and colleges and universities will be initiating history education programs that should permanently provide better trained personnel. The country will be organized in a series of regional committees on history education, which can be expected to organize themselves in a coordinating body, and these committees, under the general sponsorship of the American Historical Association, will provide national leadership in a field that will be becoming a respected and integral part of the historian's work. Something of a revolution in the profession will have been begun, and the American Historical Association will have played a major role in creating it, consistent with its own responsibility under its Congressional charter.